



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,750	06/24/2003	Peter J. Dix	17333	1002
37414	7590	09/26/2005	EXAMINER	
CNH AMERICA LLC INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT PO BOX 1895, MS 641 NEW HOLLAND, PA 17557			HOLLOWAY III, EDWIN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/602,750

Applicant(s)

DIX ET AL.

Examiner

Edwin C. Holloway, III

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Examiner's Response

1. In response to applicant's amendment filed 7-18-05, all the amendments to the specification and claims have been entered. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant's arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's opinion that the claims are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this Office action:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claim 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-22 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5912512A) in combination with Mizuno (US 5886421) or Ghabra (US 6737955).

Regarding claim 1, Hayashi discloses smart (transponder) key programming method with inserting and detecting of master key in steps 104-114 of fig. 3, col. 6 line 66 and col. 7 lines 48-56. If the master key is detected, the vehicle is placed in the programming mode or registration processing as step 120 in col. 7 lines 57 67. A second key is inserted and read in step 122 and col. 8 lines 1-5. The vehicle and second key are

Art Unit: 2635

configured to allow subsequent starting of the vehicle by registering the code of the second key in step 128 and col. 8 lines 31-46. Claims 12-13 generally correspond to the method of claim 1 with the addition of substantially simultaneously programming the vehicle and a prior operating key to deny access that is provided by the Hayashi disclosing, in addition to the limitations discussed above, that the final code is rewritten in col. 8 line 35-45 that would cause vehicle to prohibit operation if the prior key is inserted in step 314. Claim 19-20 include a system with structure to provide the steps of claim 1 that is anticipated by Hayashi disclosing structure in fig. 1 that provides the steps applied above to claim 1. Regarding claims 2-3, 14 and 22, Hayashi discloses exiting the programming mode after predetermined time in steps 126 and 116. Regarding claims 5-8, 15-16 and 21, Hayashi includes visual or light indication of programming mode or registration process in steps 120 and 130, col. 7 lines 61-67 and col. 8 lines 44-46. Regarding claims 9-10 and 27-28, disabling a prior operating key is anticipated for the reasons applied above to claims 12-13. Regarding claim 18, rewriting no. 3 code col. 8 lines 31-41 of Hayashi requires a third operator key.

Hayashi differs from the claims by not expressly disclosing programming the second smart key with a number that indicates

Art Unit: 2635

the smart key is authorized to use the vehicle.

Mizuno discloses an analogous art vehicle startup permission device and ID code registration method where the a vehicle code or number (S1) is registered in the key in addition to registering key codes or numbers (K1 K2 K3) in the vehicle so that keys and vehicle may be separately managed. See figs. 4 and 8, col. 1 line 46 - col. 2 line 24, col. 8 lines 7-8 and col. 9 lines 25-39.

Ghabra discloses an analogous art vehicle antitheft system and method where the vehicle stores vehicle numbers (PW, NUM, VIN) in a new key during key programming in order to allow investigators to determine if reported theft is fraudulent. See fig. 2, col. 3 line 62 - col. 4 line 48 and col. 7 line 53 - col. 8 line 15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Hayashi registering a vehicle number in the key as disclosed in Mizuno so that keys and vehicle may be separately managed. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Hayashi registering a vehicle number in the key as disclosed in Ghabra in order to allow investigators to determine if reported theft is fraudulent.

Art Unit: 2635

4. Claims 4, 11, 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5912512A) ^{and} Mizuno (US 5886421) or Ghabra (US 6737955) as applied above in combination with Lambropoulos (US 4881148). Regarding claims 4 and 23, Lambropoulos discloses a vehicle programming system with extending the programming time for input of additional codes in fig. 3 and col. 15 lines 20-25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included to time extending of Lambropoulos in the invention of Hayashi in order to allow sufficient time to program the desired number of codes. Regarding claims 11 and 29, the writing operation of Lambropoulos will overwrite all prior codes in all registers to allow indication of unauthorized programming or tampering in col. 14 lines 35-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the multiple code overwrite of Lambropoulos in the invention of Hayashi to indicate tampering.

5. Claims 11, 24-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5912512A) ^{and} Mizuno (US 5886421) or Ghabra (US 6737955) as applied above in combination with Enoyoshi (US 6525433B1). Regarding claims 11 and 29,

Art Unit: 2635

Enoyoshi discloses erasing multiple prior codes with the master key in col. 4 lines 60-65 and col. 6 lines 9-10 to prevent use of lost or mis-registered keys. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the multiple code erasing of Enoyoshi in the invention of Hayashi to prevent use of multiple lost or mis-registered keys. Regarding claims 24-26, Enoyoshi discloses a key with mechanical coding 14 and mounted or molded transponder 15 in fig. 1 and col. 2 line 62 - col. 3 line 40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the above structure of Enoyoshi in the key of Hayashi in order to provide both mechanical tumbler and digital code security.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5912512A) ^{and} Mizuno (US 5886421) or Ghabra (US 6737955) as applied above in combination with Mutoh (US 5621380A). Mutoh discloses an analogous art vehicle antitheft system with mode lamp turned off at the exit of programming in col. 5 lines 28-47 and it would have been obvious to have included this turning off step in the invention of Hayashi so that the user can recognize that the vehicle has exited programming mode.

Art Unit: 2635

7. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5912512A) ^{and} Mizuno (US 5886421) or Ghabra (US 6737955) as applied above in combination with Hasegawa (US 5635900). Regarding claims 24-26, Hasegawa discloses a key with mechanical coding 4 and mounted or molded transponder 4a in fig. 2 and col. 3 lines 21-43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the above structure of Hasegawa in the key of Hayashi in order to provide both mechanical tumbler and digital code security.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments file d7-18-05 with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS

Art Unit: 2635

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact an Electronic Business Center (EBC) representatives at 703-305-3028 or toll free at 866-217-9197 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at ebc@uspto.gov. The Patent EBC is a complete customer service center that supports all Patent e-business products and service applications. Additional information is available on the Patent EBC Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html>.

Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 receptionist at (571) 272-2600.

Prior to July 15, 2005, facsimile submissions may be sent via central fax number (703) 872-9306 to customer service for entry by technical support staff. Questions related to the operation of the facsimile system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197. On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to 571-273-8300. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number.


Art Unit: 2635

To give customers time to adjust to the new Central FAX Number, faxes sent to the old number (703-872-9306) will be routed to the new number until September 15, 2005. After September 15, 2005, the old number will no longer be in service and 571-273-8300 will be the only facsimile number recognized for "centralized delivery".

CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number. Inquiries concerning only hours and location of the Customer Window may be directed to OIPE Customer Service at (703) 308-1202.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edwin C. Holloway, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-3058. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on (571) 272-3068.

EH
9/22/05


EDWIN C. HOLLOWAY, III
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2635